

This is ACHERON, a Diplomacy gazette and journal of the Diplomacy Division of the NFFG Games Bureau. It appears at irregular intervals. It has no games. It is free to members of the Division, \$1/10 to regular members of the Games Bureau, \$1.50/10 to other subscribers. ACHERON is edited and published by the Division Chief, Rod Walker, 5058 Hawley Blvd., San Diego CA 92116. This is Pandemonium Publication #133.



Division dues: By a unanimous vote, an annual dues of \$1 is established for the Division. All members who submitted a ballot voted "yes", except Ken Borecki, who abstained. This is due on the deadline indicated on the enclosed ballot. Don Miller, Chairman of the Games Bureau has indicated that dues-paying members of the Division will no longer be required to be regular members of the Bureau. I would encourage you to join the Bureau, however, in order for us to keep the fullest possible contact with our parent organization. I have dues from the following persons: Don Miller, Len Lakofka, Harry Manogg, Bob Johnson, Dick Holcombe, Don Turnbull, Eric Just, and Axel Kringsman. The \$1 dues entitle you, besides to membership, to ACHERON, all published completed game summaries (which will begin to come out shortly), and a copy of the Calhamer Rulings (see later on).

1968AC: The vote on this LA GUERRE GAME was very close. Voting for "irregular" status were 7: Holcombe, Walker, Schleicher, Lindsay, St.Cyr, Fong, Ken. Against were 6: May, Lakofka, McDuffie, Just, Miller, Borecki. The game is declared "irregular", although the import of that is academic for reasons which will be clear later in the issue. The vote on recommending the deletion of 1968AC from rating lists was 5 in favor, 8 against. Those voting on each side were the same as above, save that Ken and Walker voted against. The recommendation is therefore not made.

Other business from the ballots will be brought up as we go along.

One administrative matter. As of 21 April 1969, Buddy Tretick ceased to be a member of the Division. On that date (Policy Letter #2), the first section of the Division's Permanent Rules were adopted. These included a prohibition of Chalker's Rule, which is used in LA GUERRE. While no one expected Mr. Tretick to apply this prohibition retroactively to games already in progress, there has been no subsequent change of his House Rules and new games have been started which still use this rule. As a simple administrative matter, it is obvious that Mr. Tretick does not meet at least one of the conditions for membership in the Division.

The Boardman Numbers. I have already mentioned this several other places; however, I wish to make it clear, since Buddy Tretick seems intent on weaving a tissue of fabrications about the Numbers. The Diplomacy Division has never, nor has it now, had any right or title to the Boardman Numbers. For reasons which should be obvious, the Numbers should not be part of any organization or group. If the Numbers became hooked up to the Division, the temptation to use them for our purposes might prove too tempting. Therefore, following the salutary precedent laid down by the creator of the Numbers, John Boardman, and his successors, Charles Wells and John Koning, I will continue to keep the Boardman Numbers as an independent and unaffiliated entity.

Those of you who received III, 6, of LA GUERRE, know that Tretick has the delusion that he has "relieved" me of the Numbers. He has, obviously, no such authority; in fact, if he had, any one of us would also have the authority to relieve him, and we could all assign the Numbers, relieving each other of the responsibility and creating utter chaos. Obviously, the Numbers only work when they are assigned by one person and used by all (or most) GMs. I request your cooperation in keeping confusion to a minimum. Many thanks.

The IDD. In recent issues of LA GUERRE, Buddy Tretick has announced that he has "relieved" me of my position as Division Chief (and presumably assumed it himself, in an act of unprecedented humility) and, subsequently, formed something called the "International Diplomacy Division". It goes without saying that Buddy has no authority to remove the Division Chief; only Don Miller has that power (see the

discussion of the Division's constitutional arrangements, below). Don's public statement repudiating Buddy's action was printed in NUMBER 17B, page 31, and all Division members (and Buddy) received a copy.

The IDD is a different matter. If Buddy wishes to start another Diplomacy organization, there is none who can say him nay. One might suggest that he had picked a better name, but it is clear that he considers this maneuver part of his vendetta against me. Viewing the IDD as a "rival", however, can only lead to bitterness and division, which can do no good.

The IDD is, therefore, merely another Diplomacy organization. It is founded on a "broad-base" theory of membership, in contrast to the Division, which is founded on a "narrow-base" theory (see a discussion of these, below). On 2 April 1970 I applied for membership in the IDD, and hope some of you will do likewise, encouraging your players to do so, too. If the IDD is to succeed, it will need some support; if it is to fail, it should fail on its own merits, and not for lack of support. If Buddy's public statements that IDD membership is open to everyone are sincere and truthful, he will acknowledge and accept my application. Naturally, and I hope I speak for the membership on this, the Division stands ready to cooperate with the IDD on any projects of mutual interest.

The Trade Agreement. As I have repeatedly said, it is not the purpose of the Division Chief to be utterly and universally inflexible. Our ranks are beginning to include a number of people whose ability to trade is somewhat limited. Furthermore, the universal trade requirement looks as though it might be difficult, if not impossible, to enforce in practice.

Since this requirement was instituted by action of the Division Chief without a vote, I think it can be deleted in the same way. If any large number of members strongly objects to this, we can vote on it, of course; however, I think that the Division cannot help but be improved.

In place of the universal trade requirement, there will be a dual statement on trades. First, members are strongly encouraged to trade with each other, thus perpetuating one of the oldest PBM Dippy traditions. Second, members will be required to trade with Division Archive custodians or, if the custodian is unable to trade, to allow him to subscribe. There will be a short item on the Archives later this issue. The purpose of this requirement is to insure that in a few more or less central locations, complete files of your 'zines will be kept in well-maintained collections. At the present time, designated Archivists for the Division are Charles Wells, Don Miller, Jeff Kay, and myself. Hopefully, this can be expanded somewhat.

The Division "Constitution". There is none, in the American sense of a single written document. Our "constitution", like that of England, consists of a mass of arrangements, traditions, and decisions. The most important facet of all this is the fundamental basis on which the Division rests. In essence, the Division is merely an administrative organ of the NFFF Games Bureau, created and operating under the Chairman thereof. The Games Bureau Chairman is, in turn, selected under the constitutional processes of the National Fantasy Fan Federation (over which only members of the NFFF have any control). Under the normal procedure of the Games Bureau, a Division Chief is appointed by the Bureau Chairman to serve an unspecified (in this case) term and to coordinate activities under the purview of the Division. The Diplomacy Division was once only one of several Divisions, but I think it is currently the only one.

This means that the Division Chief derives whatever authority he has from the Bureau Chairman. On the other hand, Don Miller has given me a very free hand with the Division. I have, therefore, tried to structure the Division in such a way that a new avenue of authority is derived from the membership; that is, to involve the membership in the decision-making process. I tried at first to solicit ideas in general: that pretty much drew a blank. I have more recently tried generalized proposals, and that has worked much better. There is more in another section of this issue on my ideas of the membership.

I would like to emphasize, however, that the Division Chief has three main jobs. First, he is responsible to the Games Bureau Chairman and must conform to whatever guidelines are set up by the GB. These have been relatively few. Second, he must act as chief administrator of the Division, establishing the administrative policies which make the Division function. Third, he must give effect to, and enforce, the decisions of the Division. This includes, at the moment, publishing ACHERON.

I have heard it suggested that the Division Chief is misusing his authority. If that is true, I am unaware of any evidence (other than some deliberate misstatements by Buddy Tretick) having been adduced for such a claim. In any event, the Bureau Chairman does not think so. The importance of this lies in the fact that it has brought up the question of how the Division Chief ought to be chosen. Merely holding an election is not possible, since the job is one which is appointed by the Bureau Chairman. It is possible to select a nominee for Mr. Miller's approval, however, and that would be in some sense an election. I would, of course, be perfectly willing to stand for re-election against any opponent(s), if the membership thinks this is an advisable procedure, and if the Bureau Chairman finds this procedure acceptable, and if there is at least one Division member who is willing and able to take over the job. You will therefore find, on the enclosed ballot, some business preliminary to making a decision on this question. Your comments will be very much appreciated.

Membership Philosophy. There are two basic philosophies of membership of an organization such as this. Let me first define them.

"Narrow-base" membership is the philosophy of restricting membership to a certain (presumably the most concerned) group of people, the members of this group having accepted a certain common course of action. Such a group can pursue concrete goals with considerable effect. Each member of the group is presumed to be active, rather than just a "joiner". Further, the group does not have to depend alone on the organization's publication for communication; it is (theoretically) possible for each member to contact each other member, thus allowing maximum exchanges of ideas. Finally, such a group presents fewer administrative problems and, frankly, my schedule would not allow me to work in this capacity with a larger group.

"Wide-base" membership suggests that this status is open (effectively) to anyone. Don Miller, Len Lakofka, and Buddy Tretick have all recently urged this type of philosophy for the Division, using two arguments (basically).

First, it is suggested that a wide-base group would be "more effective". This is true if, by "effective", one means "having a large membership". It is argued that the opinions of the Division would reach more people, that the Division would provide an effective forum for discussion, and so on. I do not deny that these generalized goals might be achieved, but one is moved to ask if effective forums are not already in existence, and if such a large group could develop any opinions to send out. The truth is, I think, that a large group would be less effective, not more. It would be less capable of making decisions and less capable of enforcing them. It would soon cease to stand for anything because, in opening its doors to the world, it would come to stand for everything.

Second, it is suggested that the "Division is keeping people out". Two groups of people are mentioned: some of the outstanding players and certain Gamemasters. Of the first group, none has ever indicated to me that he is interested. In any event, I could not handle administratively any large number. There are limited ways of admitting non-GMs now--and perhaps some of you could suggest equitable ways of expanding these. As to the other GMs, three are usually mentioned: John Boardman, John McCallum, and Terry Kuoh. However, the first two have indicated no interest in joining the Division whatever its form. I do not know Terry's position, but will find out when I see him this month. The point is, of course, that no matter how wise the doors are opened, some will not come in. I might point out, apropos of this, that the Division (before my tenure) had a far less definite membership policy, and never had more than half-a-dozen members. Since that time, this figure has doubled

or trebled, which would seem to indicate that a "narrow-base" membership will attract more members than a "broad-base" one.

Naturally, it is logical to assume that if there are some who will not join the Division as presently structured, there would be others who would leave it if a new membership policy were adopted. The main premise of the "broad-base" theory, that such a policy would make the organization a universalist one, is false.

This is, however, an interesting debate. Some portions of it have appeared, and will appear, in Don Willer's DIPLOMANIA. Hopefully, we will get some opinions expressed here in AGHERON. I encourage you, if you have some ideas on the "broad-base" vs. "narrow-base" thing, or on membership policy in general, send them in. I only ask that you keep them as succinct as possible.

The Permanent Rules. Last issue, as a result of negotiations with the LONELY MOUNTAIN men, I requested permission to drop "Cutting One's Own Throat" from the "forbidden" section of the Permanent Rules. I indicated that if I received no objection to this, I would count it as a unanimous vote in favor of dropping, and that one objection would be sufficient to keep that rule. I am happy to say that no objection was received; therefore, under the Division Permanent Rules it is permissible (but not required) to allow a player to cut his own support.

Nominations. In our first round of nominations in the honorary category, we have one nomination in each group. For Honorary-Full Membership, Allan Calhamer, the inventor of Diplomacy. For Honorary-Associate Membership, Gary Gygan was nominated by Len Lakofka. Gary has accepted the nomination. Len says, in his letter of nomination, "although Gary is not a GM, he has designed three excellent variants of postal Diplomacy, Kahnocracy, Rajomacy, and Napoleonic Diplomacy /and others since then, I believe...RCW*/. He has been active in numerous 'zines of postal Diplomacy as both player and contributor of pertinent remarks, articles, etc." Both names appear on the attached ballot. Election requirements are as given in AGHERON 1, page 2.

*Note. John Boardman was nominated by both Chris Schleicher and Eric Just for Honorary-Associate Membership. John refused to accept the nomination.

The SPALD games. Since last issue, the SPALD games have been transferred to Andrew Phillips, who is now continuing three of the four in SHAAFT. The projected outlines of these games would seem superfluous.

The Calhamer Rulings. Although this was originally conceived of as a Division project, it will involve many non-Division people (50% to be precise), since it is also a positive contribution we can make to postal Diplomacy irrespective of our internal work.

Conrad vonMetzke (a non-member) and I will be doing the original work. Our intent is to summarize all known Rules disputes, including a background, a sample situation, and a discussion of the issues involved. These will be forwarded to Mr. Calhamer, who will rule on each situation according to his best understanding of the Rules, explain his ruling, and indicate whether he has merely selected the best of two or more possible interpretations or has made the only ruling possible under the Rules. In addition, copies of the original material will be sent to four men who have been frequently and cogently involved in rules debates: two Division members (Jeff Key and Charles Wells) and two non-members (John Boardman and John McCallum). They will be requested to review the material and to send to Mr. Calhamer any corrections or additions which, in their opinion, are necessary.

The final result of all this will be edited and published by Mr. vonMetzke and myself. We hope it will be as close to a definitive statement on the Rules as we can get short of actual revision. Copies of "The Calhamer Rulings" will be sent free to Division members (and to Messrs. vonMetzke, McCallum, and Boardman) and will be sold at cost to others who wish them. This should all be completed before the end of 1970.

Once the CRs are published, the Division will naturally wish to adopt a position on them. Three possibilities suggest themselves:

First, we could delete the Permanent Rules and substitute the whole of the Calhamer Rulings.

Second, we could delete the Permanent Rules and substitute those portions of the Calhamer Rulings in which Allan states that only one interpretation is possible.

Third, we could keep the Permanent Rules as they are, deleting those portions which conflict with the Calhamer Rulings, adding portions of the Calhamer Rulings which can command a unanimous vote, and make the rest of the CRs "recommended".

There may be other alternatives, of course, that I haven't thought of. For next issue, I would like to ask your opinions and ideas. I would like to suggest that we decide what to do with the CRs before Mr. Calhamer makes them, sight unseen as it were, so that none of us will be influenced by finding out that Allan has ruled against one or more of our pet interpretations.

Regardless of what we do, the Calhamer Rulings will, I think, be a substantial contribution. We may get GRI to include them in their sets—especially if we pay the cost of reproduction. Naturally, if we do pay, we will get a little squib about postal Diplomacy and the Division included. In any event, if these achieve any large-scale distribution, your House-Rules could become immensely simplified, simply by referring to the Calhamer Rulings and indicating only those points at which you differ from the CRs. And, if GRI does publish them under its imprint, we might be able to adopt the position that the Rulebook plus the Calhamer Rulings in fact amount to a new "edition" of the Rules.

Weighted voting. Your responses to this question were most gratifying: many of you took time to write something, and most had strong opinions. Len Lakofka, for instance, proposed scaling the thing, so that no member would have more than 5 votes. The strongest opinions were those in favor of "1-man-1-vote", expressed by Miller, Schleicher, Key, Borecki, and myself (just because I propose something doesn't mean I'm in favor of it). On the whole, you-all don't seem too thrilled with the idea of weighted votes. The most enthusiastic support for it came from Eric Just, who voted for it "for the lack of anything better at the moment".

On the whole, while the system would be devilishly bothersome to manage, it does not seem to have any special virtues or command any enthusiastic support. Len Lakofka's suggestion that we also count variant games (at least in a prorata fashion) would help make the system more equitable. On the other hand, I'm not sure that any special virtue is conferred by running a bunch of games.

If any of you are really sold on a weighted-vote system, however, please write. If I get a substantial number of responses, we'll explore the matter further, get a workable system, and bring it up for a vote.

The Expulsion System. If I were merely to count noses, this would probably be adopted. I had 6 votes in favor (Borecki, Just, May, St.Cyr, Lindsay, Key), one in favor with modifications (Lakofka), 4 against (Schleicher, Pong, Miller, McDuffie), and 2 abstain or "other" (Holcombe, Walker).

Len suggests that we also consider, as possible grounds for expulsion, other items: "unreal and harsh deadlines, inactivity on the GM's part and unfair house-rules or rulings which are adjudged to be made at whim and not based on reason or fairness." While these are obviously bad things, there is a real problem in setting standards for judgement. What I might consider "unrealistic, unfair, or unreasonable" might to you seem perfectly proper and justifiable. Furthermore, this sort of thing may involve the Division very deeply in the internal affairs of an editor and his 'zine, which may do us all more harm than good. On the other hand, I do not think we ought to close our ears to justified complaints of this sort, even if they involve non-members.

I would like, therefore, to suggest that we observe the following procedure at least to start. Membership is an administrative matter; the Division Chief will delete from the rolls any member who fails to observe the conditions of membership —after reasonable attempts have been made to communicate and secure compliance. This is not "expulsion", but simply an administrative determination of who is and

who isn't a member. Reinstatement, in that case, is also an administrative matter. I do not intend to use this very much, since I would prefer to keep members rather than lose them.

Expulsion will be for cause. It will require a 2/3 vote of the members voting. Any member(s) may request the expulsion of any other member(s). The procedure will be as follows: A statement of charges will be filed with the Division Chief, and will be printed in ACHERON. A copy will be sent immediately, before printing, to the "accused" party. His answer will be printed. Discussion will be printed, and a vote called for, in the issue of ACHERON immediately after the issue in which the charges were printed. An expelled member may be readmitted by a 2/3 vote.

Please note, however, that I am going to ride herd on statements of charges. I am not going to waste my time, and the membership's, with people trying to expell each other as a part of personal feuds or whatever. In other words, your statement of charges had jolly well better hold water, and be really serious, or I won't print it or do anything toward instituting an expulsion procedure.

Censure may also be called for, under the same procedure as above. This would be for less serious things, and would only require a majority vote. Censure could be applied, also, to non-members, as a method for the Division to go on record as disapproving certain actions or practices. Again, however, I am not going to print charges which are silly, which I know to be untrue, or are unrelated to Diplomacy. For instance, anybody who wants to censure John Boardman for saying disagreeable political things in GRAUSTARK can forget it. On the other hand, the kinds of things that Ben Lakofka talks about may very well be the material from which censures are made.

There is no penalty attached to censure, of course, save that a large number of your peers think you've screwed up. I might suggest to all of you, however, that you should not overdo the censure bit. If we start censuring people right and left, over and over, it will carry no impact whatsoever.

Archives: Anybody have any ideas as to what we can do with the Division Archives, and what requests we might be able to make of the archivists? Your comments are invited (Jeff, Charles, Don: what would you volunteer to do?).

Membership: aside from the paid-up people listed on page 1, the following are also members when I receive their \$1 dues: Ed Halle, Jeff Key, Bill McDuffie, Hal Bueh, Chris Schleicher, Charles Wells, Larry Fong, Dave Lindsay, Sid Cochran, Larry Scott, and any other GM who wishes to join. A letter from Dave Johnston indicates he may wish to join as an Associate Member, but I have not received confirmation of this. Mike Childers is also invited to join as an Associate Member.

Invited to join as full members are: P. M. Gaylord, Scott Hankin, Terry Kuch, Louis Menyhert, Marty Kirkpatrick, Lee Childs, George Schelz, and, of course, anybody else previously invited.

Conditions of Membership (as revised, April 1970):

1. Payment of \$1 annual dues to the Division.
2. Statement of your Division affiliation in each Diplomacy 'zine you edit/GM.
3. Encourage your readers, periodically, to join the NFFF Games Bureau.
4. All-for-all trade agreement with Division Archive custodians (Jeff Key, Don Miller, Charles Wells, Rod Walker) or, if the custodian cannot trade, agreement to allow him to subscribe.
5. Use of Division Permanent Rules in all regular games begun after you become a member (and we recommend extension of them to all your games, but don't require it).
6. Participate actively in the Division (particularly, return all ballots).

The NFFF Games Bureau. Membership: \$1 per year to Don Miller, 12315 Judson Rd., Wheaton MD 20906. Membership confers reduced game fees/subscription rates in many games run by Division members. Member also receives THE GAMESLETTER, which has many useful features, including reviews of the wargaming literature and other game material. In many cases, one discounted game is alone enough to pay for your annual membership,